



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## V.—NOTES ON THE HISTORICAL SYNTAX OF *QUAMVIS*.

The particle *quamvis*, composed of *quam* + *vis*, 'how you please,' 'as much as you please,' 'however much,' (cf. also *quam vultis*, *quam vellet*, *quam volent*, and the stronger form *quantum vis*), appears first as an adverb. From this starting-point it proceeds in a steady development toward the conjunction, the path of its transition to its use with the subordinate verb being through the adjectives, adverbs, and phrases which it modifies as adverb. In tracing this development and the further history of *quamvis* as a conjunction, the usual divisions of Roman literature have been used as being the most convenient boundary posts.

I. *Pre-Ciceronian Period*.—Before the time of Cicero the original adverbial use prevails almost exclusively. In the few cases where *q.* can be said to have the force of a conjunction it has the present subjunctive, never the indicative. With the exception of an uncertain passage in Marcius Vates (cf. Baehrens, *F. P. R.*, p. 36; Festus, ed. Müller, p. 165; Holtze, *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum*, II, p. 311) it appears first in Plautus, who uses it as pure adverb with adjectives or adverbs ten times, and twice with the subjunctive in a subordinate clause. But in the latter cases *q.* has no influence in determining the mood. For example in Bacch. 82, *q. subito venias*, it has attached itself to the volitive subjunctive *venias* through the medium of the modified adverb *subito* and so made a subordinate clause of concession. This is the first stage of the transition. The second stage, i. e. the dropping of the adjective or adverb as go-between, thus leaving *q.* as pure conjunction, did not take place until the time of Varro. The only other examples of the use of *q.* with a verb (subjunctive) during this period are Cato, *de Agricult.* 1, 6, and Cornificius, *Rhet. ad Her.* 4, 46, 59. It is used as adverb once in Cato, twice in Lucilius and four times in Cornificius *ad Her.*

II. *Ciceronian Period*.—Here the use of *q.* as adverb is still in force, but the most common construction is with the subjunctive. This tendency is probably due to the influence of Cicero. The indicative with *q.* appears for the first time, and occasionally *q.* is used in a clause independently of a verb. In Varro, de l. l. 9, 56, *q. res natura subsit*, for the first time the subjunctive is used without an adverb or adjective to receive the adverbial force of *q.* Varro also seems to afford the first instance of *q.* with the indicative, de r. r. 8, 33 (Müller).<sup>1</sup> In any case the early employment of this construction side by side with the subjunctive goes to show that *in itself q.* had no mood-force.

Cicero, in the great majority of cases, uses the subjunctive, usually in the present tense. The quantitative force of *q.*, however, is commonly to be seen. It is with Cicero that there begins the use of *q.* with adjectives and phrases, even with ablatives absolute, in verbless clauses, due partly to the simple omission of the verb, partly to the extension of the original adverbial force of the particle. This usage finally extends itself even to participles. Outside of Cicero it appears but twice in this period, Varro, de r. r. 1, 4, 3, and Pub. Syri Sententiae 501 (Ribbeck). Cicero probably did not use the indicative with *q.* The only passage for which there is any authority is very doubtful, pro Rab. Post. 2, 4.<sup>2</sup>

*Q.* with the superlative of adjectives (e. g. de Or. 3, 103), and *quamvis licet* with the subjunctive (e. g. N. D. 3, 36, 88), are constructions that are met with first in Cicero. The former occurs frequently afterwards, especially in writers of the Silver Age.<sup>3</sup>

The other prose writers of this period are very sparing in their use of *q.* Caesar and Sallust employ it exclusively as an adverb, the former once (B. G. 4, 2), and the latter twice (Cat. 23, 6. Hist. Frag. 3, 48, 20). There is a tendency to connect *q.* with

<sup>1</sup> So also H. Reiter, Quaestiones Varronianae, Regimontii, 1882; Schmalz, Lat. Syntax in Iw. Müller's Handbuch. Cf., however, Klussmann, Tulliana, p. 16, Gera, 1877, and Kühner, Lat. Gram. II, p. 958, who states that the ind. first appears in Nepos, 1, 2, 3.

<sup>2</sup> So Halm, Klotz, Baier, Kühner, Klussmann, Nipperdey, Ten Brink, Schmalz, Reisig. The ind. is admitted by Draeger, Georges, Riemann, Kennedy.

<sup>3</sup> For *quamvis licet*, cf. Lucr. 6, 601, 620; Heindorf on Cic. N. D. 3, 36, 88; Hand, Turs. 3, 543.

the indicative, e. g. Nepos, Mil. 2, 3;<sup>1</sup> Lucr. 3, 403. 4, 426; Dirae, 102; Vatinius, as quoted by Quintilian 6, 3, 60, q. reus sum.<sup>2</sup>

The subjunctive, however, remains the favorite construction. Catullus does not use the indicative with *q.* at all.

III. *Period of Augustus*.—The adverbial use shows a marked falling off. The subjunctive still remains the most usual construction, while the use with the indicative, which formed only about five per cent. of all the cases in the Ciceronian period, now forms over thirty per cent. This increase is due exclusively to the poets. The subjunctive is still preferred by Vergil, who has the indicative but twice (Ecl. 3, 84; Aen. 5, 542), Tibullus, Propertius, Hyginus, Vitruvius, and especially by Seneca the elder. On the other hand, Horace has the indicative with *q.* nearly twice as frequently as the subjunctive, and Ovid, who uses *q.* almost as often as Cicero and Seneca the younger, has a decided fondness for this construction. The *Astronomica* of Manilius shows the indicative in two places, 2, 313 and 398. The only example in the prose of this period of *q.* with the indicative is in Livy 2, 40, 7.<sup>3</sup> He does not use the subjunctive with *q.* at all; but the adverbial use is more strongly represented in him than in any other writer of this period.

In Reisig-Haase, *Vorlesungen über lat. Sprachwissenschaft*, §467, the statement is made that, in good prose, the indicative with *q.* is used only in such a way that the force of *q.* is equally divided, on the one side joining itself to the verb in the sense of a simple *si* or *cum*, and on the other side strengthening an adjacent adjective. This is true so far as this passage in Livy is concerned, q. infesto animo—perveneras; but as a general statement it is wrong. *Quamvis* is often used in good prose writers without divided force, e. g. Varro, de r. r. 8, 33; Nep. Mil. 2, 3; Sen. de Brev. Vit. 6, 4, de Ben. 3, 32, 5; Col. 7, 3, 4. 6, 24, 4. 12, 18. Moreover, this divided force does not appear with the indica-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gerber, *De conj. temporis et de conj. concess. usu Taciteo* (Glückstadt, Program, 1874), fin.: "Errorem Haasei ad Reisig §305 a, p. 467, corrigere velim, qui dicit 'Nicht aus der Cic. Zeit kann der Ausdruck Nep. Mil. 2, 3 sein, denn so reden nur spätere wie Tacitus.'"

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Reisig-Haase, *Vorlesungen ü. lat. Sprachwissenschaft*, §467; Schmalz, *Ueber die Latinität des P. Vatinius* (Mannheim, Prog., 1881).

<sup>3</sup> The indicative in this doubtful passage is now pretty generally accepted. So Schmalz, Kühnast, Kühner, Weissenborn and Müller, Riemann, Sjöstrand (*Quibus temporibus modisque quamvis*, etc., utantur).

tive only, but, as has been pointed out, *q.* was used in this way originally with the subjunctive, and was constantly so used. Cf. Verg. Georg. 3, 387; Aen. 8, 379; Corn. Gall. Eleg. 67; Hor. Ep. 2, 2, 113; Tib. 4, 1, 181; Vitruv. 1, 4, 3.

IV. *First Century A. D.*—The main characteristics are the relative increase of the subjunctive with *q.*, which forms nearly sixty per cent. of all the instances, and such a marked falling off in the use of the indicative that it is employed only one-seventh as frequently as the subjunctive. Of the instances with the indicative eighty-five per cent. are in prose. The influence of Seneca is easily to be seen in this. Although he uses *q.* more often than any other writer up to this time (in 199 instances, including 12 in the tragedies), the indicative appears but four times, and the subjunctive is used nearly five times as frequently as all other constructions together. Quintilian preserves nearly the same proportion. Of those writers who employ *q.* at all, the indicative is never used by Rutilius Lupus, Germanicus, Phaedrus, Curtius Rufus, Scribonius Largus, Asconius, Pomponius Mela, Persius, Calpurnius Siculus, Martial, Juvenal, Tacitus, the younger Pliny and Caper. The marked retrogression in the indicative usage is still further shown by the fact that Celsus is the only writer of this century who uses the indicative more frequently than the subjunctive.<sup>1</sup>

In Curtius Rufus the particle appears but once and then independently (5, 4, 12). Columella, who, next to Seneca, has *q.* most frequently in this period, has the indicative in only 10 out of 103 instances. Persius employs it twice, once with the subjunctive (2, 40) and once independently (5, 70). Tacitus has the subjunctive to some extent, but in him is most marked the tendency to the independent usage.

V. *Second—Seventh Centuries.*—In the maze of degenerating Latin of these six centuries it is difficult to trace the various changes in connection with our subject. One thing, however, stands out clearly, i. e. that the subjunctive with *q.* is still by far the preponderating construction, and that the indicative is used only with comparative rareness. Of the nearly nine hundred examples at my command, covering largely the important ground in this period, seventy per cent. show the subjunctive and less

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bralén, de Elocutione A. Cornelii Celsi, 1872.

than thirteen per cent. the indicative. The *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* never use the latter construction.

It is evident, therefore, that the usage of the Latin is overwhelmingly in favor of the subjunctive in connection with *quamvis*, even when allowance is made for the comparatively few cases where the mood is due to some other cause like indirect discourse or attraction. The present is used in considerably more than one-half of all these subjunctive instances, a predominance which may be explained on the ground of the influence of the present tense in the second half of the compound. (See Kühner, *Lat. Gram.* II, p. 958.)<sup>1</sup>

Dræger is wrong in saying (*Hist. Syntax*, §566, 1) that the subjunctive in clauses with *q.* denotes, as a rule, a subjective supposition, and that not until the Silver Age did it begin to denote a fact as such. The fact is that as a rule the subjunctive in these cases simply denotes that the *degree* of the statement is left to the judgment, while in the indicative the degree is treated as a part of the fact itself.<sup>2</sup> In this way the subjunctive may denote fact as well as the indicative, and we so find it from the very first. Cf. Varro, *r. r.* 1, 2, 23, *quae tamen q. sint structuosae, nihilo magis sunt agriculturae partes.* So Cicero frequently uses a parenthetical clause, *ut est, sicut est*, etc., to emphasize the fact, e. g. *Ep. ad Att.* 12, 38, 4; *pro Rosc. Am.* 8, 22; *Tusc. Disp.* 1, 28, 70, (so without *quamvis* *Brut.* 19, 76); *Ep. ad Fam.* 9, 3, 2, *q. enim sint haec misera quae sunt miserrima*, 'for let this be as bad as you please, and (whether you please or not) it *is* very bad.' Cf. also *Sen. Apoc.* 13, *itaque q. podagricus esset . . . pervenit ad januam Ditis*; *N. Q.* 6, 4, 2, *ut q. . . . volumen juvenis ediderim, tamen tentare me voluerim.*

WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

H. D. WILD.

<sup>1</sup> On the subject of tenses with *q.*, see Keppel, *Blätter f. d. Bayrische Gymnasialschulwesen*, p. III (1883).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Reisig-Haase, §§262, 305.